UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,385	09/16/2003	William J. Sequeira	057866-134130	1608

27148   7590   05/11/2009
POLSINELLI SHUGHART PC
700 W. 47TH STREET
SUITE 1000
KANSAS CITY, MO 64112-1802

EXAMINER
STORK, KYLE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/663,385	SEQUEIRA, WILLIAM J.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KYLE R. STORK	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 April 2009</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>27-39</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>27-39</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This non-final office action is in response to the RCE and amendment filed 15 April 2009.

2.   Claims 27-39 are pending. Claims 33-39 are newly added. Claims 27 and 34 are independent claims.

        The rejection of claims 27-32 under 35 USC 101 has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 27-29 and 31-32 remain rejected and claims 33-36 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 7356530, filed 10 January 2001, hereafter Kim) and further in view of Holland et al. (US 6507867, filed 22 December 1998, hereafter Holland).

        As per independent claim 27, Kim discloses a system for converting interactive Internet content to a form suitable for distribution to clients with a limited or non-existent return channel while preserving the interactivity of the content, the system comprising:

a storage media comprising program code and a plurality of data structures, the plurality of data structures including:

a Page URL data structure storing data for use in identifying pages of interactive content (column 4, lines 45-58: Here, a URL management system (UMS) is used to store a page URL in a hash table)

a Page Partition data structure storing data for use in tracking partitions that make up a page of interactive content (Figure 1, item 14: Here, the content of a page is stored)

a Partition Link data structure storing data for use in tracking navigation data contained in a partition (column 4, line 59- column 5, line 3: Here, links contained with the page are stored. These links are used to navigate between various pages of the Internet)

a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to selecting and partitioning one or more pages of interactive Internet content (column 4, lines 30-44: Here, a crawler crawls the Internet. Each obtained page is categorized and stored, including a page's interactive links)

Kim fails to specifically disclose:

means for integrating data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and partitions into a bundle; and

means for distributing the bundle to a client device

However, Holland discloses:

means for integrating data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition

Link data structures and partitions into a bundle (Figure 7, item 740: Here, each of a

Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link are components of a web page. The

bundling web server obtains the referenced data pages and constructs a bundle. This

bundle inherently includes a Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link)

means for distributing the bundle to a client device (Figure 7, item 780)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention to have combined Holland with Kim, since it would have allowed for

efficient transfer of page components into a single packet.

As per dependent claim 28, Kim and Holland disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim further discloses

wherein the Page URL data structure contains data regarding the URL of the selected

pages and a unique identifier for each page (column 4, lines 45-58: Here, a hash table

contains the URLs of each page. The hash data structure contains a unique key, which

is used to access and identify the corresponding value (URL)).

As per dependent claim 29, Kim and Holland disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim further discloses

wherein the Page Partition data structure contains a unique identifier for each partition

(column 4, line 59- column 5, line 3: Here, the Page Partitions are identified based upon

the hash key associated with the URL of the page from which the partition was

extracted).

As per dependent claim 31, Kim and Holland disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim further discloses wherein the Partition Link data structure contains data regarding location and destination of each link in a partition (column 4, line 45- column 5, line 3).

As per dependent claim 32, Kim and Holland disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 31, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim fails to specifically disclose wherein the coordinate system is selected from the group consisting of x-y coordinates, x-y-z coordinates, or polar coordinates. However, the examiner takes official notice that such coordinate systems were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention as providing absolute positions for display of data items within a web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known location schemas with Kim, since it would have specified the absolute location of items on a web page.

As per dependent claim 33, Kim and Holland disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 27, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim fails to specifically disclose wherein the storage media is a disk. Holland discloses wherein the storage media is a disk (Figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Holland with Kim, since it would have allowed a user to store data.

As per claims 34-36 and 38-39, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claims 27-29 and 31-32, respectively. Claims 33-36 and 38-39 are similarly rejected.

5.   Claim 30 remains rejected and claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Kim and Holland and further in view of Jeffrey et al. (US

2002/0083090, filed 27 December 2000, hereafter Jeffrey).

        As per dependent claim 30, Kim and Holland disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 29, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Kim fails to specifically

disclose navigation including previous and next steps. However, Jeffrey discloses

navigation between data items including previous item and next item (paragraph 0052).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention to have combined Jeffrey with Kim, since it would have allowed a user to

easily navigate between data items.

        As per claim 37, the applicant discloses the limitations similar to those in claim

30. Claim 37 is similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed 15 April 2009 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

        The applicant's argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to

disclose enabling the system to select and partition one or more pages of the interactive

Internet content into the plurality of partitions (page 11). Specifically, the applicant

argues that Kim discloses partitioning each page into a singular partition, as opposed to

partitioning each page into a plurality of partitions (page 11). While the examiner

agrees with the applicant's statement regarding the Kim reference, the examiner

disagrees with the applicant's reading of the claim limitation. The claim limitation states,

"a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to select and **partition**

one or more pages of the Internet content into the **plurality of partitions** (claim 27,

lines 13-14, emphasis added)." This merely requires that one or more pages be

partitioned into a plurality of partitions, as disclosed by Kim. Therefore, this argument is

not persuasive.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to KYLE R. STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-

4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle Stork/

Kyle R Stork
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs